

FINAL MINUTES
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING
March 6-7, 2005
Doubletree Hotel, Sacramento, California
Meeting #79

Sunday, March 6

Representative Seat

California Department of Fish and Game	Eric Larson
California In-River Sport Fishing Community	Virginia Bostwick
California Ocean Commercial Salmon Fishery	Dave Bitts
Hoopla Valley Tribe	George Kautsky
National Marine Fisheries Service	Craig Heberer
Non-Hoopla Indians Residing in Klamath Conservation Area	Dave Hillemeier
Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry	Keith Wilkinson
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Curt Melcher, Chair
Pacific Fishery Management Council	Jim Harp, Vice Chair
U.S. Department of the Interior	Phil Detrich
California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry	vacant

3:00 pm Convene Meeting and Introduce Members.

Agendum 1. Review and Approve Agenda

The KFMC members introduced themselves and reviewed the agenda. The California Off-Shore Recreational Fishing seat was not represented.

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda.

Seconded by Dave Bitts.

One abstention.

Motion carried.

Eric Larson noted that he will abstain from all motions until he obtains approval of his seat on the KFMC from the California Governor's office.

Agendum 2. Accomplishments Report

Phil Detrich reported that an Accomplishments Report was to be provided to the Secretary of Interior to review accomplishments of the KFMC over its tenure. He referred to the handout (see Agendum 2 handout). He proposed that he and Staff draft a letter to the Secretary between now and the April KFMC meeting, and the KFMC can discuss it in April. Curt Melcher asked KFMC members to review this list and provide comments to Staff prior to the drafting of the letter. Dave Hillemeier recalled a letter drafted by the Klamath River Technical Advisory Team (TAT) to the Secretary listing their technical publications drafted over the years. Phil Detrich will refer to that in the letter. Dave Bitts asked that the role of the KFMC in the coast-wide salmon management process be included.

Assignment: KFMC members will provide comments on the content of the Accomplishment Report, using the Summary of Recommendations 1995-2003, to Staff before the April meeting in order for Staff to draft a letter to the Secretary.

Agendum 3. California Fish and Game Commission Update

Eric Larson reported that the Fish and Game Commission is anxiously awaiting the model runs from the TAT. The Commission is meeting next week, and things will move forward with a decision on the in-river allocation. It looks like the ocean fishery will be limited this year. The KFMC needs to be aware of the fact that the Commission can make a different in-river recommendation than the KFMC and the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC). Final regulations will not be made next week, but the Commission must come to closure on an in-river allocation. The rulemaking process will end in May.

Agendum 4. Report from the TAT on Klamath Ocean Harvest Model Runs

Curt Melcher thanked Michael Mohr for his work on the TAT assignments and the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) runs. Mohr reviewed the three different model runs the TAT was asked to conduct and the results shown on the second page of the handout (see Agendum 4 handout). In comparing with last year's PFMC numbers, he had to close practically everything to get model run #1 to meet the natural spawner floor. In model run #2, Mohr highlighted areas that changed compared to model run #1. Overall, stock abundance is so low that increasing harvest percentages in various places still produces really small harvest numbers. Model run #3 boosts the river recreation share by three percentage points. The shares (ratios) are different from the first model run, because California fisheries are closed proportionate to what was maintained in model run #1.

Eric Larson asked if there is a way to estimate harvest of non-Klamath fish based on this model. Michael Mohr said that can be done, but we don't have it ready today. Dave Bitts stated that this question is pertinent, because these restrictions are so severe. Curt Melcher asked how sensitive this is to some of the recreational fisheries. Michael Mohr replied that it would lead to additional opportunities in other sectors, but not a high contact rate. George Kautsky asked if there have been seasons similar to model run #1 in the past. Dave Bitts recalled that this scenario looks like 1992, which until now has been the most severely restricted season.

Curt Melcher said it looks like the tribal share of 50% is about 8,400 fish, which is down from 30,000 last year. Eric Larson asked for an explanation as to why the tribal share goes down when the river recreation share goes up. Michael Mohr said it has to do with mature/immature fish. Eric Larson continued that if we're looking at different allocations, increasing the river recreation share has an additional impact on the tribes in an already very low allocation year for them. He added that this ratio can change based on the PFMC process.

Agendum 5. Assignments to the TAT, Staff, and Members

Dave Hillemeier said that in the past the Yurok Tribe has identified a minimum emergency subsistence need of 12,000 adult Chinook. The Yurok Tribe has discussed it, and is weighing the benefits of fulfilling their subsistence need this year against maintaining their strong relationships with some of the groups they have been working with to improve habitat. Curt Melcher said he is concerned over the tribal minimum need and is curious what the natural spawner escapement would be if the TAT ran the model to achieve the 12,000 tribal subsistence number. Michael Mohr said the goal of the floor would not be changed; 12,000 fish would be allocated to the tribes off the top. Eric Larson agreed that it would be an interesting model run. It is important for the PFMC to understand the kind of issues that are occurring in the Klamath. Curt Melcher asked that changes not be made to the other allocations in the model run, in order to determine the affect on the floor. Dave Hillemeier said the Yurok Tribe is concerned about meeting the natural spawner escapement floor, but for strictly informational reasons, they would be interested in seeing the results of such a model run.

Curt Melcher asked for additional thoughts on this potential modeling assignment to the TAT. Craig Heberer recalled the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) having some impact on what can and can't be done. George Kautsky said the Hoopa Valley Tribe hasn't had the opportunity to review what was presented today, however the tribe has been consistent in not deviating from FMP conservation objectives. The Hoopa Tribe would ask for a model run that would provide 10-12,000 fish while maintaining the 35,000 natural spawner floor, for information purposes only.

Eric Larson said he would like to know the difference in the overall Chinook harvest between model runs #1, #2 and #3.

George Kautsky brought up the issue of harvest overages in 2004. Curt Melcher said the total catch in the ocean fishery was very much what we anticipated. The effort predictor and the model were reasonably accurate. Dave Bitts stated that the KFMC works with an inaccurate predictor. Craig Heberer said NMFS is reinitiating their consultation on Chinook regarding this issue.

The KFMC supported the following exercise for informational purposes:

- Assignment 1: Beginning with model run #1, reverse the scaling back of fisheries, reestablishing ocean fisheries until a 10,000 fish tribal in-river harvest is reached.
- Assignment 2: Reduce ocean fisheries further to meet the floor, and meet the tribal fishery minimum subsistence need of 12,000 fish.
- Assignment 3: Understand the associated reduction in catch for model runs #2 and #3, by component, for the overall Chinook stock.

Agendum 6. Public Comment

Don Stevens, Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS) Chair and Oregon troller, said he would like to address why the ocean fishery caught over what was predicted in the model. The fish swim all over the place and we don't know much about release strategy. He has been talking to the SAS staff, and the PFMC will have to make a decision on Tuesday as to whether Oregon will fish in March and April. There will also be a 27 inch size limit. The SAS needs time with the TAT as soon as possible if we want to present something. Oregon can take their impacts any time they want to. The TAT also needs to have the model running for impacts. Curt Melcher said he thinks it's a PFMC issue whether Oregon is open in March. George Kautsky said the last 17 days in March carry over from last year's specification.

Jerry Reinhold, SAS member and processor, said he understands that only March openings need to be decided on by Tuesday. Curt Melcher agreed that decisions on March need to be made early this week. Don Stevens added that April openings could be adopted by Thursday to go out for public comment.

Jim Welter, SAS member and Oregon sport fisher, stated that he noticed that the recreational fishery impacts on the Klamath came mostly out of the Trinity. He'd like to know if the rest of the ocean impacts are similar. Curt Melcher said the KFMC will look at the post season calculations made on age 4 fish.

Jimmy Smith, Humboldt County Supervisor and California ocean recreational fisherman, stated that given the sacrifices of all fisheries this year, the tribes should stay with their 50% harvest allocation and not go with the minimum 12,000 subsistence number.

Duncan McLean, SAS member and California troller, stated that it is encouraging to see something creative coming out of the KFMC. We need to do something here that taps everyone's resources and recognize that it is not an over fishing issue that we are dealing with this year. The source of the problems is caused by something far outside the management of the fishery - the serious problems in the Klamath River. We need to be able to access other stocks besides the Klamath that are abundant. In 1998, Fort Bragg introduced a bubble fishery. We had some studies done off of Bodega Bay that showed the Klamath fish stayed to the outside. It would be great to use some of this information in the modeling to give us more access to abundant stocks. It's nice to see things being done here even though the skies are dark. Dave Bitts added that the test fishery in Bodega Bay ran for three years and was limited to six miles off-shore, under the premise that Klamath fish were less likely to be taken on-shore than off-shore. He also hopes this information can be used as a tool where appropriate.

Don Stevens, SAS Chair and Oregon troller, stated that to allow small fisheries in the Klamath Management Zone (KMZ) on the Oregon side, we must demonstrate over a period of years that we are having lower impacts on Klamath fish. In 1987, Washington fishermen were forced to operate 10 miles offshore.

Mark Warner, Inland Sport (Friends of CA/OR Fish), stated that he doesn't know what he will say to his constituents. He is stymied by hearing things like the fishery is unmanageable-especially the ocean fishery. Dave Bitts clarified that he did not intend to say the ocean fishery was unmanageable. He meant managing for a harvest rate rather than a quota was more effective.

Jerry Reinhold, SAS member and processor, asked if the age 4 fish in last year's Klamath run were from the brood year affected by the fish die-off. Is there any correlation between those low numbers and Klamath River water releases? Curt Melcher replied that the adult die-off was in 2002. Last year's age 4s were still juveniles in 2002, but there was also a large juvenile fish kill in 2002 that affected these fish. Dave Hillemeier added that in the spring of 2002, there were some erratic flows related to court decisions, so the flows dropped down very low in late April, late May, and in June. This points to the importance of spring flows. Jerry Reinhold said this is not about user groups; this is a poor cycle year because of environmental conditions. Fish can't live without water. Dave Bitts said that everyone here agrees with the point that this is not a fishing-caused condition. He referred to the megatable and said it is a habitat situation and maybe a river habitat situation, not an ocean habitat situation. George Kautsky said there is concern that the floor wasn't met in 2004. He agrees that inaccuracies in the model may have contributed to that. Dave Bitts said we did miss the floor, but we need to make clear the lifecycles of salmon. We won't really feel the effects of the floor not being met last year until 2008.

Dave Bitts stated that he hopes the TAT will be able to look at the results of the experimental fishery that was done for three years off Bodega Bay and determine if it can assist with management this year. George Kautsky deferred to Alan Grover, who has insight on the test fishery in California. Hopefully the TAT can explain how it would be used in the KOHM.

Duncan McLean asked about the KFMC developing options even though the California Fish and Game Commission is meeting and making a decision on the in-river sport allocation next week. Curt Melcher suggested maintaining the 51%/49% harvest sharing agreement between California and Oregon. The KFMC did not direct the SAS to do something different from last year. Eric Larson agreed with Curt Melcher in that the SAS, KFMC and the PFMC need to do their work aside from the Commission's decision. He is asking for the various interests to have conversations this week to determine if the allocation will change, so that he can report to the

Commission that the parties have talked and made a recommendation. He reminded the group that the Commission does hold the authority to make changes.

Agendum 7. Potential Transport of Klamath River Juvenile Chinook

Dave Bitts discussed the fish disease presentation given at the February Klamath Task Force meeting. The *C. shasta* hot spot seems to be above Happy Camp, and with the low flow regime this year we could repeat the mortality of juvenile fish. Any talk of adhering to the natural spawner floor could be irrelevant if there is such loss. A suggestion has been made to trap juvenile out-migrant fish, hold them, then truck them around the hot spot and transport them to lower down the river. He talked to some folks at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in Arcata, and they said that the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) is operating rotary screw traps and could trap 40% of downstream migrants in the Shasta River and 10% in the Scott River. They might want to do some trapping in Bogus Creek and the mainstem as well. The approval of such an undertaking rests with CDFG and not USFWS. Trucks may be available from the Sacramento River. There are some downsides to this idea that need to be considered. There are political obstacles, and “trap and haul” may emerge as an attractive alternative to fish passage past the hydro project dams if we do it and set a precedent.

George Kautsky mentioned a disease workshop USFWS is holding on March 23; it might be worth bringing this idea up at that venue for technical analysis. He agreed that we don't want to create a new paradigm for fish management in the Klamath Basin. Another concern is the stress of that action on the fish. The Hoopa Tribe would need to be party to those decisions if they are made. Dave Hillemeier said since these are the out-migrants from a run with below-the-floor escapement, biological activities should be fleshed out with the appropriate parties before taking action. The March 23 workshop could be an appropriate venue, but it may need to happen sooner. Dave Bitts agreed that if this kind of action is going to happen this year, it needs to happen really soon. He talked about biological affects and referenced the successful fish trapping and trucking program on the Sacramento. Keith Wilkinson recalled releases from Iron Gate Hatchery in the early 1980's that had a significant amount of out-of-basin straying, which led to the adult escapement goal not being met that year. The point is that the Klamath was never credited with the production of those fish.

Curt Melcher mentioned the juvenile fish transportation project on the Columbia. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) has been concerned with this strategy. The fish do survive better but there are delayed mortality issues and the adult returns to natural spawning areas don't necessarily show positive benefits of transport. George Kautsky stated that it would be hard to track straying. An effort like this would have to be monitored if implemented. Dave Bitts stated that one way to monitor straying affects would be to have a pilot program with an Iron Gate Hatchery fish code group. He added that this option is nothing more than a desperate measure. Eric Larson stated that he will take this issue to the highest level, but in reality, it doesn't seem likely for the program to get going this year. We could try to get it in place for a later date or talk about what to do with hatchery releases.

Agendum 8. Klamath Task Force Budget Proposal for 2006

Phil Detrich reported that at the last KFMC meeting, Keith Wilkinson asked that the KFMC review the Task Force budget. He reviewed the Task Force's budget development process. The Task Force will approve a final budget in June 2005. Because it is the last year of the Klamath Act, this budget is a bit different. He referred to Agendum 16 handouts. Of interest to this group is the item #2 RFP (fish health studies, coho studies). Proposals for this RFP are due May 2. The Technical Work Group (TWG) will look at the proposals and make a funding recommendation to the Task Force. The Task Force will make their decision at their June meeting. In summary, the

Task Force is interested in the fish health issue. It is possible that as the fish health discussions continue this spring, more money could be allocated. Dave Hillemeier asked if the emphasis on fish health supercedes harvest monitoring activities. Dave Bitts stated that these are the only items in the budget that call for an RFP and the other items stand as is.

Keith Wilkinson recommended the KFMC write a letter to the Task Force stating the importance of funding for monitoring and harvest management. Dave Hillemeier suggested that such a letter be sent to the Secretary of Interior. George Kautsky referenced a table that Petey Brucker asked the TAT to look at. It put 2005 projects in order of importance. Brucker asked for direction in terms of prioritizing TAT assignments and juvenile health issues related to pathology. Dave Bitts clarified that Brucker was seeking to take advantage of the TAT's knowledge in all aspects of management to determine which of these items have priority for the \$143,000 in available funding. George Kautsky said he and the TAT can provide recommendations on these projects to the KFMC tomorrow.

In terms of the disease issue, Dave Hillemeier will draft a letter to the Task Force for the KFMC's review at their April meeting. Phil Detrich will attempt to get Scott Foote or Jerri Bartholomew to give a presentation to the KFMC in April.

Assignment: Dave Hillemeier will draft a letter to the Task Force regarding the importance of funding fish health studies without compromising fish harvest management funding. The KFMC will review the letter at the April meeting.

Assignment: Staff will contact Scott Foote and Jerri Bartholomew to invite them to make a presentation on fish disease to the KFMC at the April meeting. If they are not available, Staff will ask to show Scott Foote's PowerPoint from the February Task Force meeting.

Monday, March 7

Michael Orcutt represented the Hoop Valley Tribe.

Agendum 9. Report from the TAT on Recommended Priorities for 2006 Klamath Task Force Project Funding

George Kautsky reviewed the prioritized list of monitoring projects the TAT was asked to look at. The TAT was tasked with determining which of these are needed to support fisheries management. He made stars next to the priority projects and reviewed each of them.

Agendum 10. Report from the TAT on KOHM runs

Michael Mohr presented the assignment given to the TAT. Model run #4 allocates 10,000 fish to the tribal harvest and model run #5 allocates 12,000 fish to the tribal harvest. He reviewed the results using model run #1 as a baseline comparison (using the same sharing proportions amongst the different sectors as in 2004, with the seasons cut back). In model run #4 fishing time was added back to raise the harvest while keeping the 50/50 sharing in place. This run achieves the 10,000 fish for the tribal share, maintains the other shares, and falls short of the natural spawner floor by about 1,700 fish. Model run #5 is the same exercise with the tribal share at about 12,000 fish. The natural spawner floor is short by about 3,700 fish. Model run #6 was an attempt to bring the tribal harvest to 12,000 and also meet the spawner floor by cutting back on the non-tribal share. All commercial fishing had to be closed through August and the KMZ was closed entirely. If the non-KMZ recreational sector is left as is, the tribal share is about 11,282 fish and achieves the floor.

Michael Mohr showed a table of last fall's post-season estimated harvest of Klamath fall Chinook in the commercial sector. The table is broken out by age and by California and Oregon fisheries and is just another way of explaining the California/Oregon number from model run #6. Dave Bitts asked if the lower total harvestable number of fish could be attributed to the high number of age 3 fish this year. Michael Mohr responded that is a reasonable explanation.

Mike Orcutt had questions about harvest over the last few years and the impact on the tribal and non-tribal fishery. Michael Mohr said post-season estimates can be made, but they are uncertain and preliminary. The group discussed errors in the predictor and how they affect the tribal harvest and don't necessarily affect the ocean harvest.

Curt Melcher summarized that conducting these model runs was a good exercise. In order to maintain the minimum 12,000 tribal allocation, the floor has to be reduced by about 10%.

Michael Mohr said that he has started work on the other assignment regarding the transfer of Klamath impacts to the in-river recreation fishery and the foregone catch with that action.

Agendum 11. Public Comment

Don Stevens, SAS Chair and Oregon troll, said the SAS needs to get proposals to the PFMC by tomorrow morning. He asked if there would be any direction from the KFMC. Curt Melcher asked for thoughts from KFMC members.

Neil Manji said that CDFG is developing a briefing package, and there could be a California Fish and Game Commission decision to increase the in-river allocation. The KFMC should be prepared to show adequate model runs to demonstrate the effects of this. He is worried about whether there will be three options presented to the PFMC from the KFMC, and about the possibility of the Commission making a decision that the KFMC cannot support because of lack of model runs. He recommended the KFMC have some runs available regarding ocean commercial fishing in Oregon and California. Curt Melcher said that assignment was already given to the TAT.

Eric Larson said the KFMC already discussed this yesterday. The KFMC and the PFMC will be aware of the Commission's possible decision. We do have to prepare for certain contingencies, but the KFMC can't do that until we have the information to work with. He has asked the fishing interests to come together to have some dialogue in order to be prepared.

Dave Bitts thanked Neil Manji for his guidance. He insists on an option that looks at the existing 15% and maybe also 12% for the in-river allocation. Curt Melcher agreed that it was a valid request for in-river allocation.

Jerry Reinhold, SAS member and processor, stated that he is stunned that, with this year's projections, anyone would be considering increasing their impacts.

Don Stevens asked if anything has been done to hold Oregon fisheries harmless from the effects of an increase in the in-river allocation. Some parties are not at the table, and he prefers that California troll not make a decision for Oregon troll. He agrees having the information out on the floor to send to the Commission is beneficial, but there are still public meetings after the Commission makes a change.

Eric Larson said he is curious as to what Don Stevens is thinking in terms of Oregon. His understanding was that Oregon was not going to entertain that. Don Stevens said he heard that

Oregon was going to have to share the pain. Keith Wilkinson asked in regards to holding Oregon harmless, if the KFMC and PFMC make an allocation decision and the Commission changes that decision, where would NOAA stand on this discrimination between California and Oregon ocean fisheries?

Mike Orcutt proposed that the biases in the harvest model be looked at. He questioned the accuracy of the 50/50 sharing. Curt Melcher stated that the TAT is continuing to look at the high harvest rate from last year, and NOAA is reopening consultation and will be reviewing the performance of the model. In addition, Michael Mohr did present something that said the effort forecast is still accurate but the contact rates from last year were much higher than expected. Each year, the predictor model is updated with the previous year's data and over time these biases will be accounted for. Dave Bitts stated that he would like to know if last year's miss of the target was a result of a weak model as well. An additional issue is that over the last 5 years, the tribal sharing has strayed from 50/50.

Agendum 12. PacifiCorp Mitigation/Iron Gate Hatchery

Neil Manji, CDFG, reported that he was not aware this discussion was going to occur and is not prepared to present any information. He assumes the KFMC wanted to have a discussion on whether the mitigation request at Iron Gate Hatchery would be changed. Mike Orcutt recalled a discussion a few months ago about whether the tagging rate is appropriate at Iron Gate Hatchery. The Hoopa Valley Tribe has some resources that are potentially available this fiscal year to increase the tagging percentage, but we don't know enough about long-term things like mitigation goals. Other parties like CDFG, PacifiCorp and the Department of Interior need to be engaged in order to hear the co-managers' perspectives.

Neil Manji stated that the idea was to start with increasing the constant fractional marking. There are a few ways to do that. At this time there are so many variables out there that we don't know if the current hatchery production will continue, but he understands we need to discuss increasing the marking rates. A lot of parties will need to be involved in these discussions, but we are a little bit ahead of the game here. CDFG needs to develop hatchery genetic management plans, which will address these types of questions. Dave Bitts raised concern about the lack of hatchery marking leading to difficulties in predicting the ocean fishery. Neil Manji replied that marking wouldn't go away, but the groups will all have to get together to look at current practices and decide how the hatchery should be operated.

Agendum 10 (cont.) Report from the TAT on KOHM runs

Michael Mohr presented additional information dealing with each model run conducted (see Agendum 4 handout). He reviewed run #1 and showed harvest forecasts in four tables. The first two are Klamath harvest forecasts for the troll and ocean recreation sectors. The next two tables are for all Chinook troll and sport. We have the same set of tables for model runs #2 and #3.

Agendum 13. Develop Additional Recommendations for Discussion with the Salmon Advisory Sub-panel and Presentation to the Pacific Fishery Management Council

Curt Melcher revisited the PFMC agenda for Tuesday. He must give a report from the KFMC. He asked how he should convey the fact that the KFMC has considered model runs that are less than the floor. Eric Larson said he would like to see the KFMC make a decision and statement tomorrow that we are not considering an option to fish below the floor. He would also like to see the KFMC put forward an option that provides for a continued process through the PFMC for in-river at 17% and 15%. This moves forward with the final three options and allows the Commission to work with this process rather than outside of this process.

Dave Bitts stated that he has mixed feelings about considering options that go below the floor. He has no problem sending out an option of 12% for the in-river fishery for modeling and reviewing. Virginia Bostwick would like to see the 15%, 17% and 20% modeled for the in-river fishery for the benefit of the Commission. Dave Bitts stated that he would have a hard time sending out an option for any kind of consideration of a season that gave 20% to the in-river fishery.

Michael Orcutt stated that the KFMC would have to provide a strong justification for emergency action for going below the floor. Discussion at the SAS included a multitude of habitat issues, and we need to account for how we got to where we are today. We should not go below the escapement floor to get around this. He would support giving a message that shows the KFMC as responsible managers.

Curt Melcher concluded that the KFMC does not have consensus on an option that is less than the floor in terms of escapement. He will go forward with the understanding that the KFMC is intending for all options to meet the floor.

Dave Hillemeier stated that a future agenda item should be a technical review of what the floor represents. Phil Detrich agreed that this would be a good legacy for this group to leave in its last year.

Assignment: Staff to include time for discussion on what the floor technically represents on a future KFMC agenda.

Michael Orcutt commented on the sun-setting of the Klamath Act. The position of the Bush Administration is still unknown, and it seems a simple task to write a letter asking the fate of this group as managers. Curt Melcher said we are working on a letter that documents the achievement of the KFMC. He added that in spite of the 52% ocean harvest rate in 2004, we are the only user group that annually estimates and reports its impacts to Klamath fall chinook in an open, transparent public forum.

Eric Larson stated that failing to make a recommendation to the PFMC is not a good situation with regards to the California Fish and Game Commission. Short of having some sort of option on the table, we are setting ourselves up for a problem in April. He would like to try to come to consensus today on options to go forward to the PFMC including 15% and 17% for the in-river fishery. He would like to present all the model runs to the Commission and convey that the KFMC's recommendation included an option that provided for 17%.

Virginia Bostwick clarified that even if there is no recommendation from the KFMC, Eric will still present all model runs to the Commission. Eric Larson agreed, as it would put the 17% out for public comment. Curt Melcher stated that if there is opportunity for public comment before the Commission makes a decision, then Eric Larson's proposal is valid. Larson added that if the KFMC has no recommendation, then we are basically saying that the KFMC is not deviating from the 15%. We should show the Commission that we have at least considered a compromise in the 15-17% range. Dave Bitts said a compromise to him is everyone taking a hit and not taking from any other entities. Curt Melcher mentioned that the tribal and ocean fisheries are foregoing catch even to meet the 15%. The group did not agree on a range of options.

Agendum 14. Public Comment

Jimmy Smith, Humboldt County Supervisor and California Ocean Recreational Fisherman, stated that he appreciates the KFMC making difficult decisions. The credibility of the KFMC is not at

stake, but at this time, without more representation, it is difficult to discuss changing the in-river allocation.

The meeting was adjourned.

Attachment 1

FINAL AGENDA
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING
March 6-7, 2005
Doubletree Hotel, Sacramento, California
Meeting #79

Sunday, March 6

3:00 pm Convene Klamath Council meeting and introduce members

Administration

1. Review and approve agenda
2. Accomplishments report

2005 Management Season

3. California Fish and Game Commission update
4. Report from the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) on Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) runs
5. Assignments to the TAT, staff, and members
6. Public comment

General

7. Potential transport of Klamath River juvenile Chinook
8. Klamath Task Force budget proposal for 2006

7:00 pm Recess

Monday, March 7

Reconvene

2005 Management Season

9. Report from the TAT on recommended priorities for 2006 Task Force project funding
10. Report from the TAT on KOHM runs
11. Public comment

General

12. PacifiCorp Mitigation/Iron Gate Hatchery

2005 Management Season

10. (cont.) Report from the TAT on KOHM runs
13. **Action:** Develop recommendations for the 2005 management season, for discussion with the Salmon Advisory Subpanel and presentation to the Pacific Fishery Management Council
14. Public comment

Adjourn

Attachment 2

***MOTIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING
March 6-7, 2005
Doubletree Hotel, Sacramento, California
Meeting #79***

Motions:

Agendum 1

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda.
Seconded by Dave Bitts.
One abstention.
Motion carried.

Assignments:

Agendum 2

KFMC members will provide comments on the content of the Accomplishment Report, using the Summary of Recommendations 1995-2003, to Staff before the April meeting in order for Staff to draft a letter to the Secretary.

Agendum 8

Dave Hillemeier will draft a letter to the Task Force regarding the importance of funding fish health studies without compromising funding for monitoring that supports fish harvest management. The KFMC will review the letter at the April meeting.

Staff will contact Scott Foote and Jerri Bartholomew to invite them to make a presentation on fish disease to the KFMC at the April meeting. If they are not available, Staff will ask to show Scott Foote's PowerPoint from the February Task Force meeting.

Agendum 13

Staff will include time for discussion on what the natural spawner floor technically represents on a future KFMC agenda.

Attachment 3

LIST OF HANDOUTS
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING
March 6-7, 2005
Doubletree Hotel, Sacramento, California
Meeting #79

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Agendum 2 | Klamath Fishery Management Council-Summary of Recommendations 1995-2004 |
| Agendum 3 | California Fish and Game Commission Update – Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations, February 18, 2005 |
| Agendum 4 | Assignment to the Technical Advisory Team on Klamath Ocean Harvest Model Runs, February 24, 2005 |
| Agendum 4 | Klamath Fishery Management Council Modeling Exercise, February 24, 2005 |
| Agendum 4 | Continued - Klamath Fishery Management Council Modeling Exercise, March 7, 2005 |
| Agendum 8 | Press Release of Fiscal Year 2006 Request for Proposals, March 1, 2005 |
| Agendum 8 | Fiscal Year 2006 Request for Proposals, Fishery Restoration Work for the Klamath Restoration Program, March 1, 2005 |
| Agendum 9 | Request from Petey Brucker, chair of the Technical Work Group: List of Monitoring Projects and Studies for the Klamath River Technical Advisory Team to Evaluate and Prioritize, dated February 24, 2005 |

Informational Handouts

Klamath River Basin Spring Chinook Salmon Spawner Escapement 1980-2004 (From the February 23-24, 2005 KFMC meeting Agendum 10a handout)

Editorial: Short-sighted Klamath Fisheries Managers Dismiss Chinook Plan. Eureka Times Standard, March 3, 2005.

Attachment 4

LIST OF ATTENDEES
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING
March 6-7, 2005
Doubletree Hotel, Sacramento, California
Meeting #79

The following individuals attended the Klamath Fishery Management Council meetings in Sacramento, California on March 6-7, 2005.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Jimmy Smith	Humboldt County
Richard Heap	Oregon South Coast Fisherman
Jerry Barnes	Klamath River Technical Advisory Team
Bob Crouch	Klamath Management Zone Fisheries Coalition
Jim Welter	Salmon Advisory Sub-panel, Oregon Sport Fisher
Desma Williams	Yurok Tribal Fisheries Program
Don Stevens	Salmon Advisory Sub-panel, Oregon Troller
Dave Yarger	FMABB
Gerald Reinholdt	
Frank Warrens	Pacific Fisheries Management Council
Mark Warner	Friends of Cal-Ore Fish
George Kautsky	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Desma William	Yurok Tribal Fishery Program
Mark Newell	OSC
Duncan MacLean	Salmon Advisory Sub-panel, California Troller

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Bob Crouch	Klamath Management Zone Fisheries Coalition
Jim Welter	Salmon Advisory Sub-panel, Oregon Sport Fisher
Jimmy Smith	Humboldt County
Richard Heap	Oregon South Coast Fisherman